

Senate Panel, With Film and Reports,

By JOHN W. FINNEY
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, July 30—The Senate Foreign Relations Committee

which has been the focal point of the opposition to the Administration's Safeguard antiballistic-missile program, rested its case today with a private showing of a movie and the introduction of three secret Pentagon reports in an effort to show that the Safeguard system was ill-determined for its job.

Whether the movie showing or the introduction of the three studies would influence the outcome in the closely divided point where they probably will Senate was doubtful. After nearly four weeks of debate, positions have hardened to the not be changed by further argument.

But at least the Foreign Relations Committee was prepared to let the issue come to a vote, probably next week after the return of President Nixon from his global trip.

More Votes Needed

At this point the opposition believes it can count on a minimum of 50 of the 100 Senate votes—a tally that presumes it will win the support of Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Democrat of Washington, one of the few remaining uncommitted Senators.

While under strong pressure

from his Democratic colleague from Washington, Senator Henry M. Jackson, to vote with the Administration, Senator Magnuson reportedly indicated that he is likely to vote against deployment of the Safeguard system.

With a 50-50 tie vote, the opposition amendment prohibiting Safeguard deployment in the coming year would fail to be adopted. To prevail, therefore, the opposition must pick up the vote of at least one of two other uncommitted Senators—Clinton P. Anderson, Democrat of New Mexico, or John J. Williams, Republican of Delaware. Or the outcome may turn on which Senators can be persuaded upon to be absent on the day of the vote.

As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee's Disarmament Subcommittee, Senator Albert Gore, Democrat of Tennessee, contended that the three Pentagon reports failed to support the design of the Safeguard system as a "hard point" defense for Minuteman

Rests Case Against ABM

To this line of argument Senator Barry Goldwater, Republican of Arizona, replied in a Senate speech that the opposition was engaging in a "mutually self-defeating" argument by contending on the one hand that the Safeguard system would be ineffective and on

the other hand warning that its deployment "will so frighten the Soviet Union that it will immediately escalate the arms race."

A Main Objection

One of the principal technical objections raised by the opposition is that the ABM components, originally designed for protection of cities under the Johnson Administration's Sentinel program, are ill-suited for protection of missile bases, as proposed under the revised ABM program set forth in March by the Nixon administration.

According to Senator Gore, this objection was supported by the three Pentagon studies, which examined alternative ways of protecting the Minuteman silos against a Soviet "first strike" attack.

One of the studies, entitled "Report of the Jason Panel on Hard Point Defense," was prepared in 1967 by the Jason Division of the Institute for Defense Analyses—the Pentagon's weapons analysis group. Another was entitled "Radars for Hard Point Defense" and was prepared last year by the Aerospace Corporation—the Air Force's technical adviser on missile and space programs.

Both reports, according to Senator Gore, emphasized that hard point defense presents different technical requirements

than a city defense, particularly in the design and number of radars. Both reports were said to have recommended that for a hard point defense of missile bases there should be far more radars than proposed in the Safeguard system and that the radars should be protected or "hardened" against the blast effects of a nuclear explosion.

A similar conclusion was said to have been reached in a report on an ABM conference held last November at Cape Kennedy Fla., by the Pentagon's Advanced Research Projects

One Radar Per Base

In the proposed Safeguard system, there would be only one missile site radar—the key radar that provides guidance to the interceptor missiles—at each of the Minuteman bases to be protected. This radar is able to withstand only about one-tenth of the blast that can be withstood by the underground Minuteman silos, making it vulnerable to attack.

After considering the Pentagon reports in the morning session, the Foreign Relations Committee in the afternoon had

a private showing of a movie that reportedly showed that offensive weapons can penetrate any missile defense system.

The movie was prepared by the General Electric Company, now one of the major Safeguard contractors, before the Nixon Administration decided upon an ABM system to defend missile bases.

On behalf of its case, the Pentagon also supplied to the committee a one-page memorandum on the conclusions reached by a task force of the Defense Science Board at a meeting last March. The memorandum said the task force, headed by Dr. Richard Latter of the Rand Corporation, concluded "that systems design appeared to be adequate and would meet the stated objectives for the Safeguard system."

Not supplied by the Pentagon were the conclusions reached by the task force at another meeting held in recent weeks. According to Senate sources, on re-examination the task force raised many of the technical reservations about the design of the Safeguard system that were contained in the other reports.